



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

But our definition must be wrong. Evidently "pacifists" and "pacifism," which is their philosophy, must mean something far different; evidently quite the opposite. Since the most "brittle intellects," measured by the results of the last six years, must have been those intellects which produced the World War, and since "pacifists" and "brittle intellects" are synonymous, the arch-pacifist of this generation must have been William Hohenzollern. If so, Colonel Roosevelt has put his finger on the nub of the world's difficulties. "Pacifists" and "pacifism" should be "dead," much deader than they are, quite as dead as our new Assistant Secretary craves they might be. "Dead" is not enough. The deader the better!

COMMON IDEALS—NOT FORMAL ALLIANCES

COUNT OKUMA, veteran "Elder Statesman" of Japan, in his prime a leader of its Liberal forces and a founder of schools of learning dedicated to freer thought than was permissible in the national universities, of late has been somewhat of a disappointment to his former admirers in Europe and America. The "blot on his escutcheon" always will be his assent to the demands made upon China during the late war, by which the Tokyo government secretly and effectively for a season intimidated the Peking authorities and sought to get a strangle-hold on the republic and its vast resources.

Count Okuma seems to be returning now to his better self. On the question of Japan's alliances, and especially her relations with Great Britain, he is reported in the *Japan Times* as saying:

"I am of the opinion that no great nation ought to make so much of help to be expected from other nations in times of emergencies. What is worthy of the permanent trust of an independent nation is the justice of her cause and her own strength. If Japan's friend, Great Britain, or any other powers be found in difficulty in pursuit of a just cause, and if Japan can afford to extend a helping hand, why should she not come to the rescue, if requested, whether there be any agreement for such a purpose or otherwise? On the other hand, Japan need not help others if their difficulties have been caused in consequence of a disregard of justice and of humanity, even if they be allies of Japan. . . . It is to be hoped that the Japanese will rise above the desiring of any sort of alliance treaties. So long as Japan depends on the other nations, through treaties or otherwise, for the attainment of her objects, so long will she remain subject to the disadvantages arising from the ever-changing conditions and attitudes of the foreign powers."

Reflection on this statement induces at least two trains of thought.

It harmonizes with the historic American point of view recently defined anew.

It recognizes as the norm of international relations, not a formal compact, but a standard of justice and of interest in humanity's welfare redefined in the light of contemporary conditions. Loyalty to a humane, just ideal rather than to any political relationship is made supreme.

NEW PEACE TECHNOLOGISTS

THERE ARE writers in Central Europe calling attention to the fact that the idea of the League of Nations has always been closely connected with the idea of a world parliament. This group of writers, of whom Dr. Alfred H. Fried may be said to be the best known, expresses frankly the opinion that the recent meeting of the Assembly of the League of Nations at Geneva reveals that the gathering known as the League of Nations is but a league of diplomats. True, most conferences heretofore have been called to arrange the aftermath of war, while the Geneva Conference convened for the purpose of preventing future wars. Among the delegates at Geneva were "progressives," some of whom were even opposed to the policies of the governments that sent them. This, the writer believes, is true of the Socialists—Barnes from England, Branting of Sweden, and La Fontaine of Belgium. Certain smaller European States and some States overseas sent firm believers in the peace idea. Thus old and new ideals met and clashed in Geneva. The representatives of the new spirit demanded publicity, while the old stood for secret sessions. From this clash a compromise was found to be necessary. The result was that the meetings of the conference were secret, but the minutes of the meeting were published.

This group of Central Europeans is impressed, however, with the differences of opinion prevailing at Geneva as to the nature of the conference itself. Their point is that Lord Cecil of England and Viviani of France looked upon it as a conference of delegates, whereas Hagerup of Norway, Usteri of Switzerland, and Hymans of Belgium claimed it had the character of a world parliament.

Writing in the *Arbiter-Zeitung* of Vienna, under date of December 9, Dr. Fried expresses his opinion that Viviani's statement comes nearer to the truth, and he agrees with the *Manchester Guardian* in insisting that the League of Nations ought to be purged of diplomats. He goes on to point out that under pressure of public opinion there is a possibility of developing in the right direction. This was shown when the controversy about the powers of the Council was finally settled, for now it appears that the general meeting which convenes annually is a meeting of the sovereign powers, while the Council is its mandatory during the adjournment, and thus becomes a standing committee merely. This, Dr.

Fried believes, is a progress in the democratic sense, not wholly unlike the victory of the Lower House over the House of Lords in England. As the way of electing the delegates is left to the discretion of the various members of the League, there is another possibility of democratic development if the governments see fit to have the delegates elected by the people, or at least by the parliaments. Only in this way the conference can become a parliament of humanity. This, Dr. Fried believes, must be the final outcome, since the League of Nations is supposed to be an instrument for the prevention of war. The diplomats of the old school cannot pursue a peace policy. He adds, "Peace technologists of the modern type are needed to conform the interests of their nations to that of humanity."

AFTER REPUDIATION, WHAT?

IT SEEMS perfectly clear that any organized attempt to arouse support for the so-called League of Nations cannot meet with any general approval in the United States. So far as this country is concerned, the League of Nations as proposed out of Versailles has been repudiated by the United States Senate, by a "solemn referendum" of the American people, and by the man who has been chosen to guide our foreign affairs for the next four years. The League of Nations can receive no support in our Senate; it can expect none at the hands of the present administration.

The repudiation of the League of Nations is not confined to the United States. When faced with the problem of deciding whether or not she should resume former commercial relations with the Russian Soviets, the Swiss Federal Government has not consulted with the League of Nations; it has simply refused upon its own initiative to do business with a government whose funds are to a considerable extent the result of confiscation of property and whose methods are "terroristic." Furthermore, that little representative republic of Central Europe has declined to allow military forces to traverse her territory on the way to Vilna. Correspondence from League officials endeavoring to alter her decision has not changed the situation. Switzerland entered the League with a reservation guaranteeing her traditional neutrality; and she insists that her soil must be kept inviolate, even against the forces of the League. Denmark has also found it constitutionally impossible to furnish troops to the League of Nations. Furthermore, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, and Switzerland have served notice that they will never yield to the Council of the League of Nations the right to decide when a blockade shall be instituted. The "absolutely compelling" moral obligations, as defined by Mr. Wilson, have been repudiated. The legal commission of the League

itself has practically informed Mr. Wilson that his interpretation of Article X was erroneous. To undertake to "preserve," they say, means simply an undertaking to "condemn" external aggression against the territorial integrity of existing political independence of all the members of the League.

This attempt to invest the cause of peace with the sanction of military force has been repudiated on all hands. Indeed, the demand for the elimination of Article X from the Covenant of the League has been very general, even at Geneva. Mr. Balfour freely admitted at Geneva that many amendments to the Covenant would be necessary. Even Lord Robert Cecil, arch-protagonist of the Covenant, grants that provisions relative to economic blockades are "very unsatisfactory."

As the pro-League Republican in his Article No. 3 wrote in the *New York Times*: "In the present state of world opinion an organization attempting to bind the nations to wage war at any future time and in indeterminate crises is not only unwise but impossible." And as the same interesting Republican defender of the League granted in his first article: "As was clearly manifest at Geneva, the 'automatic' exertions of the armed forces of the nations—possibly, also, of the economic boycott—are feasible only in a world so advanced in idealism as to be scarcely in need of them." Evidently the American people have sensed these things.

Our not altogether friendly sister American republics, not to mention Canada, are also finding the Paris Covenant unacceptable. The action of the Argentine representatives at Geneva in withdrawing from the Assembly is a familiar fact of current history. In this hemisphere the notion seems to prevail that our Pan-American League is more hopeful than the plan proposed in the Treaty of Versailles. Dr. Manoel de Oliveira Lima, well known Brazilian diplomat and at one time exchange professor at Harvard University from South America, speaking recently before the joint session of the American Political Science Association and the American Historical Association, in Washington, said: "The great trouble with the larger and more recent League of Nations (may I say the late League of Nations?), which was said to be universal, but in fact was restricted to a managing and patronizing board, was that it resembled too much an old-fashioned school, with a severe set of masters, frightened pupils, and even a whip lying on the table for the corrections deemed indispensable. Politically it was a council; it was never a league. Yet precedence pointed to a different way." Thus the repudiation of the Paris Covenant seems all but complete.

And yet the roads to peace are not closed. Thoughtful men continue to realize that human interests can rest securely only upon juridical foundations bound together by the cement of law and good will. Hence faith